UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,529	03/23/2004	Hieu Trung Tran		3430

7590   05/31/2007

HIEU TRUNG TRAN / VIOSOFT CORP.
SUITE 203A
2959 S. WINCHESTER BLVD
CAMPBELL, CA 95008

EXAMINER
PUENTE, EMERSON C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/807,529	TRAN, HIEU TRUNG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emerson C. Puente	2113	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Emerson C. Puente_.   (3)_____.

(2) _Hieu Tran_.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: _5/24/07_.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
          c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☐ No.
    If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _1,7,16,22,31, and 37_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Madduri '140 and Akgul '650_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☐ was not reached.   h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _Examiner and applicant discussed the differences between the prior art references (Madduri '140 and Akgul '650) and claimed invention, specifically the issues mentioned in the PTOL 413 A (see attachment). _.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/807,529   First Named Applicant: TRAN, HIEU TRUNG

Examiner: EMERSON C. PUENTE   Art Unit: 2113   Status of Application: _____

Tentative Participants:

(1) EMERSON C. PUENTE   (2) _____

(3) HIEU TRAN   (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: MAY 23rd 2007   Proposed Time: 2 ____ (AM/PM)

EST

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) [X] Telephonic   (2) [ ] Personal   (3) [ ] Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [X] YES   [ ] NO

If yes, provide brief description: ATTACHED TO THIS REQUEST

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) #102	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
(2) #103	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
(3) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(4) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

[ ] Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:
SEE ATTACHMENT TO THIS REQUEST FORM.

_____

_____

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

_____   _____
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature   Examiner/SPE Signature

HIEU TRUNG TRAN
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

_____
Registration Number, if applicable

Form PTOL-413A Attachment

Issues To Be Discussed

Claim Rejections – 35 USC #102

In regards to the rejection of Claims 7 and 37:

[1] The Examiner cited Madduri disclosure that entry into a hardware debug mode indicates a hardware debugger or agent. Claim 7 and 37 of the Application disclose a method of intercepting the OS loadable module loading system call. Difference(s) are:

- Madduri hardware debugger or agent does not run on the remote computer whereas the methods of Claim 7 and 37 is a software agent that runs on the remote computer

[2] The Examiner cited Madduri's disclosure of setting a bit that causes into a debug mode or software interrupt. Claim 7 and 37 of the Application disclose a method of intercepting the OS loadable module loading system call by saving the entry in the OS syscall table and replacing such entry with a pointer to the debug agent memory image. Difference(s) are:

- Madduri setting a bit is done via the external JTAG interface to the remote computer. Claim 7 and 37 disclose a method of intercepting the OS loadable module loading system call by the software agent entirely on the remote computer

- Madduri setting of bit puts the CPU on the remote computer under a CPU-specific debug mode. This CPU-specific debug mode is not sensitive to the OS that runs on the remote computer, nor events that are specific to the OS, such as the OS loadable module loading system call. Claim 7 and 37 disclose a method that is specific to the interception of said events. Furthermore, claim 7 and 37 does not put the CPU of the remote computer under a specific mode of operation, nor does it require that such mode of operation be available

Claim Rejections – 35 USC #103

In regards to the rejection of Claims 1, 16, 22, and 31:

[3] The Examiner cited Madduri disclosure of entering into hardware debug mode. Claim 1, 16, 22, and 31 disclose a method of debugging that comprise of running the debug agent on the remote computer. Difference(s) are:

- Madduri hardware debugger or agent is a separate JTAG hw debugger whereas the method of Claim 1, 16, 22, and 31 comprise of a software agent that runs on the remote computer, and

- Madduri does not disclose methods for replacing OS kernel code and data by the agent to intercept the processing of debugging traps, whereas the method of Claim 1, 16, 22, and 31 does

- Madduri also failed to disclose that the debug agent is loaded from persistent store and execute on the remote computer, as pointed out by the Examiner

[4] The Examiner cited Akgul disclosure of using debugger modules that are loaded into the target system memory and execute only when they are needed for debugging purposes. Claim 1, 16, 22, and 31 disclose a method of debugging that replaces the kernel code and data as a mean to intercept the processing of debugging traps. Both Akgul and Madduri fail to disclose said replacement of kernel code and data, which is an essential component of the method presented by the Application.

The combination of Akgul and Madduri disclosure by one of ordinary skill in the art would not lead to a method of debugging wherein the kernel code and data are replaced at the time when the debug agent is loaded as a mean to intercept the processing of debugging traps.